UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The World of Ideals and the World of Fact - - - - - - *George E. O'Dell*

Cloisters for War Objectors? - *H. Geiger*

Liberty in Community - *Dorothy Bushnell Cole*

The Approach of Reconciliation - - - - - - *George M. Gibson*

Lydia G. Wentworth - - *Ralph Westlake*

Thoughts on Robert Nathan's Book, "A Winter Tide" - - - *Edith Lovejoy Pierce*

Correspondence

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 6

Chicago, August, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
National Unity—CURTIS W. REESE 87
Types of Liberalism—CURTIS W. REESE 87
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 88
ARTICLES—
The World of Ideals and the World of Fact—GEORGE E. O'DELL 91
Cloisters for War Objectors?—H. GEIGER 94
Liberty in Community—DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE 95
The Approach of Reconciliation—GEORGE M. GIBSON 96
Lydia G. Wentworth—RALPH WESTLAKE 99
Thoughts on Robert Nathan's Book, "A Winter Tide"—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 100
POETRY—
When through the Depths—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 101
THE STUDY TABLE—
A Statesman of Eternity—RALPH CHEYNEY 101
Book Notes by CHARLES A. HAWLEY 101
CORRESPONDENCE—
Vital and Affirmative—LUCY ADAMS WILLIAMS 102
Comprehensive and Concise—ROBERT WHITAKER 102
Entirely Reasonable—ROSE W. SNELL 102
Democracy through Socialism—E. H. BARRETT 102
Felicitations—HENRY H. GRIFFITHS 102
Editorial Anonymity—PAUL P. SWETT 102
Not Interested in "Journal of Opinion"—ORLIE PELL 102
Policy—ROBERT B. WHITAKER 102
Fundamental Differences—HELEN SWIFT NEILSON 103
Totalitarianism Versus Democracy—DAVID JOBMAN 104
THE FIELD—
The Proper Study of Mankind Is Man—SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD 86

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Proper Study of Mankind Is Man

SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD

Is Humanism a religion, especially that brand of Humanism which is known as Religious Humanism? Many people on both sides of the religious "fence" deny Humanism the right to call itself a religion: those of the orthodox "right" say there is no religion without a belief in God and immortality, and classify Humanists as atheists, while those of the atheist "left" repeat the statement and charge Humanists with being either "tainted" with religion or too timid to declare themselves the atheists they really are. The answer to the controversy is a true definition of religion, not a dictionary definition based on popular misconceptions, but a definition based on an historical study of world religions and a knowledge of religions as they have actually been and are. One of the leading contemporary authorities on the history of religions is Professor A. Eustace Haydon of the University of Chicago, and he defines religion as "a shared quest of the good life." Professor A. E. Crawley, a former leading English anthropologist, stated "the religious emotion is no separate feeling, but that tone or quality of any feeling which results in making something sacred." Professor Julian S. Huxley, grandson of Thomas Henry Huxley, writes of religion: "It is a way of life. It is a way of life which follows necessarily from a man holding certain things in reverence, from his feeling and believing them to be sacred." There is no mention of a belief in God and immortality in any of these definitions, yet they are all definitions of religion. These and other men have learned from a study of the history of religions that religion evolved into being before the gods and that the gods were created by religion and not *vice versa*. Even certain established religions have made many converts without a belief in God, i.e., original Confucianism and Buddhism and Jainism. Early Judaism and Buddhism also had no belief in immortality. There is no reason, other than the ignorance of the masses regarding the nature and history of religion, why there should not be a modern scientific religion without a belief in God and immortality.

Humanism *is* a religion because it has the basic qualities of religion as stated in the definitions quoted. (1) Humanism ardently desires and is striving for the good life based on the principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number." This quest is "shared," as it believes in the biological brotherhood of man and that success can be obtained only through coöperation. For this end it wishes to use the entire available knowledge gained by experience through the ages and apply it through Scientific Humanism. (2) Humanism is a religion because it has that "feeling which results in making something sacred." This something is not a day of the week like Sunday or an article of clothing like a pallium, not even a belief in God, but is humanity itself.

(*Continued on Page* 104)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII AUGUST, 1941 No. 6

EDITORIAL

CURTIS W. REESE

NATIONAL UNITY

In his support of the foreign policies of the Roosevelt Administration, Wendell L. Willkie has won a firm place in the affections of the American people. It would have been easy for him to become the hero of the opposition groups, and to place Wheeler and Lindbergh in decidedly secondary roles. By his democratic and patriotic conduct, Willkie has not only proved that he can discern important issues but he has also made a permanent contribution to national unity. By comparison, Landon and Hoover do not show up as well as their friends could wish. When the larger issues for which America stands are at stake and when our very existence as a free people is menaced, is no time for partisan divisions. In the selection of Knox, Stimson, Stone, and others not so well known, Mr. Roosevelt has set a good example of non-partisan action.

There is, of course, always room for difference of opinion on both major and minor issues that arise for national decision. In a democracy it is natural and proper that such difference should be debated. But when the decision is reached, the action called for should not be sabotaged. Particularly is this true in international affairs, where national unity is of the utmost importance. Our present policies of aid to Great Britain and her allies, of Hemisphere defense, and of keeping open the highways of the seas are policies that have grown out of our history and that have been widely debated. They are now American policies, and for the immediate future should be accepted as such without further ado.

And while it is to be expected that there will be difference of opinion in regard to auxiliary measures, such as the occupation of Iceland, it should be remembered that our world is vastly different from that of our fathers, and that in pursuance of our traditional policies larger steps must be taken than would formerly have seemed wise. Not only is the world different, America also is different. We have come of age, and must now take our proper part in planetary management. In advocating larger American responsibility in world affairs, I do not myself give as large a place to the idea of national defense as is at present current. Defense is important not because it preserves our skins, but because it preserves us for large duties and far-reaching responsibilities. America is no longer the fair-haired boy of the nations, in knee-pants and sailor collar. America has reached manhood, and must take on the responsibilities of a grown-up man. Among these responsibilities is that of carrying our fair share of the burden of world management. But our foreign responsibilities and our present period of stress should not be, as many seem to think, an occasion for a moratorium on domestic social progress. On the contrary, it should be a time of deep searching and of vigorous reform. While there should be no let-up on the foreign front pending perfection on the home front, still the real answer to President Hutchins, and more particularly to the groups with just grievances, is the steady and persistent continuance of the program of putting our house in order. Long steps in social progress have been taken in recent years; but there are other and still larger steps that are overdue. We must not tolerate at home the evils we fight abroad. National unity grows best in the soil of security and justice.

TYPES OF LIBERALISM

In our correspondence columns is a letter taking sharp issue with some of the statements in my July editorial, "The Beginnings of a New World." This letter strikingly illustrates the wide difference that exists between a certain type of earlier individualistic liberalism and a later phase of social liberalism. The earlier liberalism believed in survival through individual struggle and was highly critical of government; the later liberalism believes in a large measure of mutual aid and is highly hopeful of the expanding functioning of government as an instrument of coöperative action. The chief belief held in common by these two types of liberalism is that of the value of free discussion.

A rereading of the editorial in question will show

that I specifically assumed the tried and proved values of the past but centered attention on certain assets that belong uniquely to the modern age. Regarding trends mentioned, it can be said confidently that government now assumes a responsibility for human well-being to an extent unheard of a few generations ago, as witness the social welfare legislation that has been enacted and put in operation in many countries in the last half century. Specifically in the United States one could point to workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, free employment service, old age security, farm legislation, the guaranty of bank deposits, and a long list of health and educational measures. One may not like this trend but its existence can hardly be denied. The trend toward world citizenship is evident in the whole modern world where smaller units have been federated into nations; where nations have been federated into larger units, such as the British Commonwealth; where efforts have been made at world organization such as the ill-fated League of Nations; and where the volume of literature dealing with world issues is increasing almost daily. As to the supreme importance of love as motivation, my point was not that truth and justice are unimportant but that love is of supreme importance. My belief that love is supremely important is held not because I believe it to be Biblical doctrine but because I believe it to be psychologically sound. Furthermore, love is certainly the heart of the Christian ethic.

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Everybody is in favor of a "brave, new world." But this world is never coming until we get rid of war To discuss such a world, its principles and promises, is only foolishness so long as war is with us. It is something more than foolishness when such discussion is coupled with support of war. For the very war being supported is itself the undoing of the new world of which we bravely dream. There is only one thing worth talking about today and that is the elimination of war. There is only one thing worth doing today and that is opposing war. There is only one thing worth serving today and that is the cause of peace. For years Voltaire lifted the single cry, "*Ecrasez l'infame.*" Crush the infamy—the consuming infamy of the medieval church which in that day underlay, with its superstition and intolerance, all other infamies whatsoever. Nothing else would Voltaire consider but this one evil. Nothing else would Voltaire do but fight this one evil. "*Ecrasez l'infame*"—and then at last would men be free! Now the "*infame*" of our day is war, as in the days before the Civil War in this country it was slavery. There come moments in history when, through the accident of circumstance, or the mere course of human events, one issue becomes paramount. It takes its place as a *sine qua non*—without this, nothing! This is what we see today in this matter of war. Unless this be abolished, nothing else is possible. We are going to destroy war, or else war is going to destroy us. We have come, in this period of history, to this particular crisis in human affairs. It is the recognition of this crisis, perhaps, which most clearly differentiates the pacifist from other men. There are other points of differentiation, of course—some more fundamental as involving ethical and spiritual realities! But, here in the very forefront of action, lies this distinction—that the pacifist can see nothing worth doing today but getting rid of war before it is too late! The pacifist says, as Paul said when he looked upon the cross of Christ—"*This one thing I do!*"

II

Mrs. Isabel M. Paterson, writing in the New York *Herald-Tribune* "Book Review," has this to say:

> . . . We couldn't help being amused by the predicament of Mr. Sumner Welles, when he got all worked up over the Germans socking Russia, as if it were almost beyond belief. . . . Mr. Welles began warmly: "To the leaders of the German Reich sworn engagements—engagements regarded by a happier and a civilized world as contracts to which the honor of nations was pledged—are but a symbol of deceit." . . All true, and will Mr. Welles look back on the records of the Administration to which he belongs and see what it did to contracts it didn't want to keep?

Which raises one of the most vital questions of the hour—namely, what does a promise mean? So far as the evidence seems to show, in this as in other countries, a promise, a contract, a treaty pledge, a campaign platform, means just precisely nothing at all! President Roosevelt solemnly stated to the citizens of America that "this country is not going to war"—and the organized drive to take the country into war, beginning with the President's own cabinet ministers, is storming furiously ahead. Last September, when the National Guard was inducted into federal service, it was agreed that the service was for one year and that at the end of that time the guardsmen would be returned to their homes and business offices. Now Washington proposes to keep these men in the ranks for an indefinite period. In order to pass the conscription bill over determined opposition the administration made a solemn contract, in spirit if not in letter, that the men should be drafted for a single year only. Yet General Marshall, Chief of Staff, seconded by the President himself now proposes that the conscripts be held during the duration of "the emergency." What does a promise mean? About as much in this country as Hitler's promises mean in Europe. If I were to name any one thing more than another which has led to the collapse of civilization, it

would be the loss of the moral sense as illustrated by flouted promises, broken contracts, and abrogated treaties. Hitler's record is notorious. But the Fuehrer is not unique in his utter lack of conscience. Think of France—solemnly bound to fight with England to the end, and surrendering to the Reich the moment she was beaten! Here is our own country, pledged to her own citizens and to the world to a policy of strict neutrality, and straightway by her government made an ally of Great Britain. President Roosevelt guaranteeing to the fathers and mothers of this nation not to send our boys to foreign soil, and now sending these boys to Iceland! Mr. Willkie supporting today a foreign policy which he promised in his campaign to oppose, and explaining lightly that his pre-election pledges were only campaign oratory! This is the record, which could be extended indefinitely, of the moral practices of our time. There used to be a man described in the Bible as one who "sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not." What has become of that man?

III

Is it possible that we are all fooled, and that Hitler is really a benefactor of mankind? This question is suggested by a note in the *Reader's Digest* (July) to the effect that "loss of life in bombed England actually is less than in peacetime." This statement is soberly made by James B. Forgan, Chairman of the Chicago Chapter of the American Red Cross. Says Mr. Forgan:

> By taking automobiles off the highways, by exercising caution in the home and in industry, by improving diet, by safeguarding self and community from the threats of epidemics through sanitation, vaccination and immunization, the English are saving more than their enemies are able to take.

This reminds me of a statement in John Buchan's very noble autobiography, *Pilgrim's Way,* which gave me a jolt when I read it. Speaking of the complacency and security of pre-war days which were threatening to eat away the foundations of our civilization, Buchan says (page 292):

> We have been shaken out of our smugness and warned of a great peril, and in that warning lies our salvation. The dictators have done us a marvellous service in reminding us of the true values of life.

This seems to me to be drawing a pretty long bow of optimism. If we were to be logical in such belief, then we would be praising Hitler and not blaming him. Indeed, we would be raising statues to him in the public squares. And we should agree, if we be logical, that the coming of such a man, at intervals in history, to correct our faults and warn of our dangers and cut down our death rate, is a good thing. Which means that the Hitlers and Napoleons and Genghis Khans are in reality the saviors of the race! Well, well, logic can do strange things. Only if Mr. Forgan and Mr. Buchan are right, why should we wait for these conquerors to help us out? In Mr. Forgan's case, for example, why should America not immediately proceed to cut down its frightful losses of life by "taking automobiles off the highways, by exercising caution in the home and in industry, by improving diet," and so forth? Or must we really go to war in order to accomplish this beneficent result? If so, then Charles Lamb's Chinese peasant who burned down his house in order to roast his pig was one of the wise men of all time.

IV

War isn't so bad. At least it isn't all bad. It has some good results. Look, for example, at the things which are going to happen in this country as a result of the European war and America's defense measures. Washington is announcing some of these things and telling us to brace ourselves for the shock. But they don't seem to me to be so bad. Huge taxes on cigarettes, cigars, and tobacco! Well, that's all to the good. If smoking can be cut down, the nation will profit; if not, then make the smokers pay and pay again for an unsocial habit. Huge taxes on liquors! Hurrah, that's grand! Soak the boozers till they scream for mercy. "Beer may be bottled in glass containers rather than in tin cans." Hurrah again! These new beer cans are the worst litter we have today on highways, in the woods, and on the beaches. People don't seem to throw away glass as they do tin, so here's a gain. "Women may not be able to buy as many silk stockings." Now, that seems a pity. But when we read that the famous woman pilot, Jacqueline Cochran, had taken thirty-six pairs of stockings with her in piloting a single plane to England, we think perhaps that this restriction also may be wholesome. "Women may have to go longer between permanent waves and get along with fewer astringents, facial creams, and other cosmetics." O, how wonderful! What a blessing if we could see again a woman's natural hair and natural complexion! It is warned that anyone who buys two cars when he needs only one "is unpatriotic." That's sound policy; and why not extend it to the man who buys one car when he needs none? As for the man who buys a yacht these days, says the government, he will be "regarded unfavorably by other Americans." And why not? Thus are restrictions proclaimed upon our habits and ways of life, luxurious beyond all compare with other peoples in the world. I can think of few things better than these restrictions. If a time is coming when a whole generation of Americans will be compelled to "do without," I shall have hope that a renaissance in this country may be on the way. We may even restore the proud day when Henry David Thoreau found it possible to get along with twenty necessities as compared with the modern American who demands more than nine thousand. We shall worry about restrictions in wartime when they touch the essentials of life—free speech, for example, and free press, and free assembly. Watch out for these; let the others go!

V

The London correspondent of the *Friends Intelligencer* is disturbed by what is being said about the morale of the English people under the strain of the Nazi bombardments. The stories of this amazing morale have long since taken on a uniformity that excites suspicion. Every newspaper report like every private letter, describes the unvarying cheerfulness and courage of the people as their homes are ruined, their friends and families killed, and themselves perhaps horribly wounded or maimed. Can it be possible that these people have no nerves—that they are more than human? Of course it has long since been proved that human beings can stand anything, and get used to anything—that is, for a time. But this constant and uniform extolling of how the English act under Nazi attack from the exploding skies has at last ruffled the patience of this Quaker correspondent. He thinks it time that we had some truth. "I don't for a moment wish to minimize the dogged courage with which the British people are meeting the calamities of the present time," he writes. And then he quotes the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, as talking about the "joyous serenity" of the people in the bombed areas which he had been visiting and their glad participation in the "sublime emotions of the battlefield." To which this quiet Quaker retorts, with studied moderation, "I think that the Prime Minister was too much in thrall to a certain romanticism in [this] latest utterance." "Romanticism" is the word for it! This romanticizing of war's horrors is one of the greatest curses of war. Talk about "joyous serenity" and the "sublime emotions of the battlefield" is nonsense. The English people are enduring the tortures of the damned. They are enduring these tortures because they have to—and doing it with magnificent courage. They are brave beyond words, but not joyful, or serene, or lifted up by "sublime emotion." On the contrary they are wracked and torn, strained to the breaking point, and praying day and night for peace. It is cruel to these sufferers to suggest that they are taking these terrors like a night's headache. Or that they can stand it indefinitely! Ernie Pyle, Scripps-Howard reporter, recently returned from England, wrote a paragraph worth pondering:

> You can take a one-night blitz, for it's climactic and vastly exciting—and you have to take it, anyway. But get five or six or eight or ten nights in a row—pounding night after night after night—with the odds of your survival growing slimmer every night and death and chaos and disruption all about you—yes, very definitely there's a limit to what anybody can take.

VI

Evidences of war hysteria have been collected and published abundantly in these columns. Now comes a scientific explanation of this hysteria. Why do people get so excited about war? Why do they want their country to go to war? Why all these crazy things said and done? The talk about democracy and civilization sounds fine, but there's something going on underneath. What is it? Well, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, an organization of more than four hundred professional psychologists, has investigated this problem and made a report. Signers of the report include Gordon Allport, of Harvard, L. W. Doob, of Yale, Hadley Cantril, of Princeton, and E. R. Hilgard, of Stanford. There are two main categories of persons who, with much serious talk about ideals, go jittery on the war question. Says the report:

> In the first category one finds persons, who, under the stress of real or imagined threats to their security develop a mental set which makes them see danger where it does not exist. Thus some people suspect all aliens of being Nazi, Fascist, or Communist agents, and imprisonment or internment is demanded.
>
> In the second category are found those individuals who have been frustrated in their own private lives, and in consequence develop aggressive attitudes toward individuals and groups that can be placed in the position of scapegoats.

Commenting on these two groups of hystericals, the report goes on to say:

> In both the above categories are cases of spontaneous and unconscious persecutory behavior, but there are also individuals or groups whose motives are more deliberately directed. These persons frequently rationalize their opportunistic behavior in terms of patriotism, national security, and similar appeals, and associate the threat to their profits with a threat, imagined or real, to plans for meeting the national crisis.

These psychologists like other liberty-loving individuals, are devoted to democracy, and take pains to proclaim that they "recognize the importance of preserving and extending democracy." They see dangers to democracy abroad in the world—dangers from without, and also from within. But they state that they regard it "as necessary to point out, however, that during times of crisis many individuals are more apt to be influenced by prejudice than by reason, and that excess of feeling may lead to acts of the gravest injustice."

Here is science at work on the question of what's the matter with us. Its a kind of mental disease or mania, quite as likely to strike the more as well as the less intelligent. Its ravages are all the more dangerous as cloaked, unconsciously rather than consciously, under a sober garb of public spirit. The peril involved is obvious. For this is the state of mind that takes a nation into war and leads civilization straight to disaster.

VII

In the midst of all the madness and hatred incident to this war there are things to lift the heart. For example, the 1000 American clergymen signing the solemn pledge not to "bless, sanction, or support war" (see last issue of UNITY, page 71), have now been increased to 1900. * * * The *Christian Pacifist,* a 24-page monthly magazine published in London, is maintaining as steadfastly as ever the whole gospel of absolute pacifism. This paper, beautifully printed and ably edited, is announced as the organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Christian Pacifist Crusade (Congre-

gational), the Methodist Peace Fellowship, the Unitarian and Free Christian Peace Fellowship, the Baptist Peace Fellowship, the Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, the Anglican Peace Fellowship, et al. These English Christians are opposed to war, and say so as bravely today as yesterday. * * * There is announced in England the publication of a pacifist book, *Into the Way of Peace,* written by members of the Church of England. Among these pacifist authors are Canon Charles Raven, Chaplain to His Majesty, King George VI, the late Miss Evelyn Underhill, world-famous mystic and philosopher, John Middleton Murry, distinguished author, the Venerable Archdeacon Hartill, the Reverend Kenneth Rawlings, and others. * * * In a debate at Ridgewood, New Jersey, between Norman Thomas and Prof. Henry Van Dusen on America and the war, Mr. Thomas received the roaring approval of a packed audience for his plea that America stay out of the war. * * * The Catholic Laymen's Committee for Peace, following the statement of Bishop Joseph P. Hurley, of St. Augustine, Florida, that President Roosevelt and not Congress should decide whether and when this country should go to war against Germany, sent telegrams to all the Catholic bishops in the United States declaring that Bishop Hurley's speech was "a serious mistake," and "bids fair to do great harm to the church in general and to the American hierarchy in particular." * * * Canada is selling Victory bonds to pacifists with a guaranty that the money received from such bonds shall be used for humanitarian and not for war purposes. The bonds bear no interest. * * * Miss Helen Alfred, director of the National Public Housing Conference, has resigned her position to give all of her time to the campaign for keeping America out of the war. * * * In the last war, a group of young women peace workers published a pacifist news-sheet, *Four Lights.* It was twice suppressed by the U. S. Post Office for its forthright advocacy of peace. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom is now planning to revive this paper.

The World of Ideals and the World of Fact

GEORGE E. O'DELL

In the Natural History Museum on Central Park West, among the many exhibits relative to the life and culture of the North American Indians, one of the objects included is a thin slat of wood about twenty inches long and two inches broad, with sharpened edges and a hole bored through one end. It is described as a toy. The original possessor attached to it a rawhide thong, enabling him to swing the wooden slat in circles at high speed and thereby produce a booming sound.

Now that slat is an example of one of the most interesting of religious objects. While it is true that certain primitive tribes have treated it as a toy, it is in the same case as our children's dolls, which, originally, were the images of child gods. The bull-roarer, as the slat is commonly called—the anthropologists seem to have invented no more lofty name for it—really belongs with the Christian cross and the more ancient swastika, in that it has circled the world. The swastika, of course, for all its horrible modern misapplications, is a prehistoric symbol of the sun apparently turning clockwise in the heavens—a symbol of light, universal light, even, perhaps, for the more spiritual in their thinking, the "light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world"; and it has through thousands of years been lifted up by many peoples in many parts of the globe.

But the bull-roarer is almost, though not quite, as prevalent an object. You find it among historic and more ancient "artifacts" in North and South America, in Africa, in Sumatra, in Melanesia, among the aborigines of Australia and the Maoris of New Zealand, and, strange to add, in Poland and among the early Scots. Sometimes it has served to amuse the children; more often, and to this day among certain primitive peoples, it has been the most sacred object religion knew. Its booming could be heard for miles in the forest night; it was used in the initiation of tribal boys to manhood—by their fathers, for their mothers were not permitted a sight of it. It is said, however, that tribal mothers in parts of Australia, or in British Columbia, have not always believed in its magic. Apparently what Abraham Lincoln said does not apply only to men,—you cannot fool all of the women all of the time! For in some tribes they have tried to terrify the women with the booming, but privately have disabused the minds of the boys.

More generally, however, the roaring of this slat of wood has been definitely taken for the voice of a spiritual being. The savage could stretch a piece of skin over a cylinder and bang it with a stick so that it made a loud noise and he could perhaps construe it as a matter of cause and effect. But that immense roaring of a bit of wood must surely be a voice called out of the sky, out of another world than the world of sight and touch! The witch-doctor, besides, would take care to interpret what the voice said.

Here, in this crude and naive assumption of evidence for two worlds, would seem to be a first step on a ladder leading up to the heights where men have discoursed of a world of ideas and ideals, of supramundane reality, and of what, with increasing variety and vagueness of definition in these days, has been called "God."

On one of the highest rungs we meet, of course, with Plato, who might tell us, for instance, that such a thing as a platform speaker's desk is less real than the ideal for such an object. For it has a function, and never can it perform it to absolute perfection. It is a shade too high or too low, or too sloping, or too slender, or what not. And indeed every speaker may have his own needs, and no desk but one ideally fit for him could quite meet them. Further, you might get all the speakers decently dead and buried—which might not be wholly disadvantageous—so that none would need a desk; and then even dispose of everybody else; yet still

there would be the permanent possibility of beings arising somewhere in the universe who were afflicted with speakers who needed desks, and once more the idea and ideal of a desk would appear, from where? Surely from some timeless realm of patterns. More than this, Plato would insist, certain ideals *operate,* they press for realization in the world of things; their own reality is proved by the fact that they can so work, and through the mediation of us spiritual-material beings produce results in our empirical sphere. In a sense, they are more real than the copies in which we seek to embody them.

Therefore, to a Platonist, there is a false antithesis in our title. Insofar as ideals move us and are creative, they are facts. We are entitled to distinguish between ideals and facts only so long as we use our terms in a colloquial or literary sense, and not in a philosophic one. Using the terms loosely we know quite well what we mean—we are thinking about the perhaps realizable but not yet realized, and for practical discourse we are entitled to do that.

The great eighth chapter of the Hebrew Proverbs, obviously under Greek influence, tells us how the word "wisdom" was "set up from everlasting," and by it God made our world. The gospel of St. John reiterates the thought in its opening sentences, and carries it to the highest pinnacle of greatness: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." *Was* God! That is to say, was creative. For "word" read "Idea," for except as idea, word is of no significance. "The Idea was with God, and the Idea *was* God." Such is the nature of the world of ideals.

Two illusions should at this point be considered. One is the illusion that matter and mind can, for mind, be got onto the same plane. The primitive tribesman thinks air (which he cannot see) to be less material than a rock or a tree or his own body. The chemist reduces the air to elements; the physicist still further to protons, electrons, neutrons, and these still more subtly to electric discharges; and, if he steps out of his sphere, he is liable to wonder if he has not now got closer—by means of these attenuations—to pure mind. But there remains a surely unbridgeable gulf between the most mysterious of electric discharges and, say, the will-to-righteousness! You cannot get your loves and loyalties, your ideals, the "readiness that is all," into the same category with wriggling particles and their assumed substratum of physical force.

The other illusion is more serious. It is that, after all, there *are* no ideals, except will-o'-the-wisp fabrications of the mind,— that, at best, ideals are continually being created (instead of themselves creating) by situations. For every situation, its own ideal; and so there are no "absolutes." But this is a complete begging of the question. All that can really be meant is that no two situations are absolutely alike, and our social or moral rules are "rules of thumb," though some are very august rules of thumb, which must be adapted to meet differences. But only the complete, and even callous, skeptic will say that in any given crisis there is no real right or wrong for that crisis. Our very rationality cries out at such a thought, and our conscience presses us that there is *some* choice we ought to make rather than another. There is a right ideal for the situation, and the question whether this is implicit in the situation or is, in the poetic phrase, a "pattern laid up in heaven," merely indicates how hardly we escape from doing our thinking in material, spatial terms.

So crude, alas, is our habitual thinking that only rarely do we become conscious of belonging in two worlds, in one of which are thoughts, feelings, purposes, decisions, and, in the other, realizations. Science feeds us marvels, but do we often note the marvels of our common life? Here are at this moment so many human beings facing a platform; here is a speaker addressing them. All the speaker does is to make clackings with his tongue and teeth, and blow air through his throat, yet his mental images and ideas pass to his hearers; and reciprocally his hearers, by a poise of the head, a physical aspect of the eye, convey to him that his thoughts arrive and help him to continue.

Or think of the spiritual mediumship—at least as astonishing as any seance phenomena—whereby a Thomas Mann or a Thomas Wolfe or a Margaret Mitchell takes a multitude of facts and builds them into an interpretative vision for us—acting as a spiritual medium between ancient Palestine or the old South or the raw American town, and us.

Ideals press for realization, but not all with the same urgency. Ideals of truth and beauty do not insist on themselves as do ethical ideals, and for the obvious reason that we are social beings, who may be able to survive without science or art, but cannot without morals. Science and art have contributions to make to social conduct, but more essential are certain ways of living together, ways of give-and-take, of respect for rights, of acceptance of duties. Our survival is inconceivable apart from these; no community is possible except on certain terms.

It is a commonplace of the sociologists that our mental characteristics, though not necessarily originating in occupational needs, have been by them built into our natures and given their efficacy thereby. There are certain primary modes of getting a living—in particular, hunting, fishing, agriculture, and the keeping of flocks and herds. Early civilizations were built on one or another of these, and by each of them appropriate sorts of character were fostered. The alertness of the hunter, the patience of the fisherman, the solicitude of the shepherd, the will-to-sacrifice for fertility's sake of the grower of crops—these are, with many accompanying such traits, now part of our own "body and blood," for good or for ill, in our uneasy adaptations to a close-packed industrial age. We are born into a world of ideals, many of them stringing along to us out of a vastly distant past. And occupational ideals hold our souls in hard grips when they are immediately relevant. Instructive indeed, whether to the student of ethics or to anyone who has a religious faith in the worthwhileness of man, is the evidence for the power of such ideals even over the least tutored, the most uncultured, if they have long been part of the furniture of the mind. Your present speaker once edited a newspaper in a colliery town, where he was indeed a lonely man among uncouth people with whom he could get into no close fellowship. But let there be an explosion underground, and the sight of the men of all ages, even those with families, swarming to beg the chance to go down at the imminent risk of life and limb, on the mission of rescue, was a revelation of idealism pressing for realization, never to be forgotten. Here were men moved by ideals to which they had been used from childhood, occupational ideals, and no personal or social crudity linked them with the brutes rather than with the stars.

Or sometimes it happens that a group of sewer cleaners start down the ladder of a manhole, men of little

or no learning, of no fineness of language, accustomed to daily dealing with filth, men most of us would not want to know. But there is poisonous gas at the bottom of the ladder-way and a man falls unconscious. The second follows, seeking in haste to save the first, and falls beside him. Perhaps even another. But yet another has time to think, and dashes away to get water to "lay the gas," and all may in the end survive. Again an occupational ideal, a commonplace of the mental background of these rough workers, and it makes them kin of Moses, of Socrates, of Jesus, of whom you please. Let us never despair of ideals. They *work*.

Here we have come upon what should be our main thought relative to our topic—the thought of the democratic nature of morals. Ethics is for all, and, in broad essentials, for all alike. Let us for a moment turn back to the earlier thread of our argument—it will perhaps lead us to the kind of democratic conclusion we want. We were perhaps a little too cavalier in our reference to science and art. For both have contributed to ethical progress—the one by eliminating barbaric superstitions, the other by enhancing our appreciation of human values. Art, in particular, has been a handmaid of ethics. Think of those amazing sculptures of the Italian Donatello, his "St. George," magnificent in manliness, bringing back the great Greek admiration for the human form, but with centuries of Christian influence giving now to the classic splendor a new significance, a finer idealism, even though by way of protest, startling, compelling protest, against the ascetic, monastic, medieval ideal. Men began to want to look like St. George, and not like anemic saints. Women increasingly chose fathers for their children from among the more masculine, more athletic types,—even where they knew not Donatello the influence spread. A century later came Raphael, painting Madonnas whose exquisitely human, motherly beauty still further helped humanize humanity. Men chose women to be mothers, when they could find them, who looked like that. Marital selection again did its inevitable work, increasing through succeeding generations the number of such faces and figures in the Western world. This was the world of ideals working in the world of fact. And of course there have been, and always are, a multitude of such persuading, impelling forms operating in our midst. Today, for instance, we have the motion picture screen molding our ideals of face and form, influencing choice for marriage and parenthood, setting the seal of our "screen idols" on children yet to be born!

Speaking thus of the motion pictures brings to mind one of the most profoundly moving of screen plays, moving if only for the pathos of one of its scenes and the splendor of one of its lines. In "The House of Rothschild," the old founder of the Rothschild fortunes lies dying surrounded by his sons—wealthy men all. For what should they use their wealth? Their father gives them the word: they are so to live and act as to further the day when "every Jew shall walk the earth with dignity." A tremendous phrase—"walk the earth with dignity." Today the Jew is not alone; he belongs in an immense company, of untold millions, who may not walk the earth with dignity. And to walk the earth with dignity is one of those elements in the world of ideals that must somehow for every man be made an element in the world of fact.

Dignity? A strange blight in this connection has fallen on the world of art, the world of Donatello and Raphael, in its function as mediator between ideal and fact. Not the movies; not, as it happens, sculpture; certainly not architecture; but often the drama, and almost always painting. Between the Masterpieces of Art at the World's Fair and the exhibit of contemporary paintings by artists dependent on public relief, there was an especially significant difference. Putting aside as of primary interest to painters, and the intelligentsia of art, questions of composition and color, surely a great contrast for the ordinary observer, with his alienable right to an opinion on human values, lay in this,—that the great painters of the Renaissance had an immense sense of the dignity, the nobility, the greatness characteristic of man, while the contemporary painters rarely have it at all. And this was the more striking in exhibits at a Fair which told in such magnificent ways of human progress, ways due to science and the growth of a liberal spirit in the world. It is not only the contemporary painters, these disadvantaged, doubtless often underfed, recipients of relief, but the blight is a commonplace of all painting—except for an occasional mural—in our day. In the regular showings you will find better technique, but no greater respect for man. You will find interest, a great modern curiosity about our world, a healthy recognition that ugliness is not without aesthetic values, a virility that discards mere prettiness,—and often a terrible pathos, on the edge not of hope but of despair. Those Federal painters reduced you to tears. But if you visit the art schools of today and see the work whether of their students or the master instructors, the "human interest" in their paintings has no nobility, it tends too frequently to be drab, derelict, pitiable, inspiring horror. Whether Titian paints a pope, or Moroni a tailor with his shears, or Frans Hals a roisterer, or Rembrandt some poor woman old and worn-out, or Raphael a simple peasant woman as the Mother of God, always you are uplifted with the sense of human greatness, triumphant and splendid or still shining, though sadly, out of tragic defeat; in modern painting even the portraits rarely rise above a mere goodnatured affection for the sitter.

This would be calamitous apparently beyond redemption but for the fact that criticism, even though it be that of what Emerson called "a repining age" (and our painting is often criticism) implies an ideal. It is the world of ideals thrusting itself in to express resentment, possibly an eternal hope hiding for greater effectiveness in the manners of despair. It is as though painting refused to see greatness, to portray a godlike poise, to admit magnificence in the human soul, when it is for the most part only the fortunate who can pay the artist's bill. The democratic spirit demands—like Whitman in his "Whoever you are, now I put my hand upon you that you be my poem"—dignity for all or for none. And in its bitterness, through the painter, for the most part it accords it to none. The obligation, let us admit, is rather that of us all and not primarily of the painter to rediscover it and give it play.

How shall we do it? It can be only by the way of a religion that is ethical first and last, a religion such as all art may yet make its own, a religion which refuses to believe that the burning fire of idealism, the sense of a vision to be accepted and made into fact, is possible only to a few and cannot be, as in those poor colliers and cleaners of drains, in some measure a heritage of all. For the moral will is no matter of genius. Does it need genius to tell the truth, to be honest, to

give a clean vote in an election, to be a decent husband, father, worker, friend? Intelligence, knowledge, imagination, sympathy and opportunity may differ and situations may be of varying complexity, or new and strange, and genius may play its part here; but so long as a man lives we cannot prove him incapable of moral shame, of somehow coming to seek after such rightness as he can understand. And should he never so seek, then in modesty let us assume that our science and art, perhaps our own belief in the reality of ideals, have not been enough, have not won us the key to the saving of this one or that one who has gone astray.

The great venture of ethical religion is the venture of faith in common human potentialities; the great *adventure* is in seeking ways and means of reaching the moral potentiality in all, and building in them the dignity which the democratic spirit craves but can achieve only as it awakens the will-to-righteousness, and brings the worlds of ideals and facts into ever closer action and reaction, each upon the other.

Cloisters for War Objectors?

H. GEIGER

The record of the National Service Board for Religious Objectors presents a curious contradiction. To the everlasting credit of this organization, it succeeded in broadening the definition of the conscientious objector to include all those who oppose war on moral grounds, whether or not they are members of the traditional Peace Churches. Although somewhat colored by sectarianism in forms of expression, both the passages relating to conscientious objectors in the 1940 Selective Service and Training Act and the questionnaire Form 47-A are conformable to the spirit of the Bill of Rights and a great advance in true democracy over the 1917 Draft Law.

But having won this victory, the N.S.B.R.O. proceeded to a strange compromise agreement with the government. In the name of *all* conscientious objectors, it assumed responsibility for the financing and administration of work camps where C. O.'s might fulfill their term of service as provided by the Act. It may be argued that the N.S.B.R.O. acted on behalf of only religious objectors. But can the agents of that organization conscientiously affirm that from the beginning they were sure that their action would not work against the establishment of other camps? Manifestly, they *risked* the possibility of committing all conscientious objectors to the program of the N.S.B.R.O.

What is wrong with these religious camps? To many war objectors they seem like an opportunity to buy one's way out of the army. Soldiers get paid, but because of this special arrangement with the government, admittedly to avoid supervision of the camps by federal officials, the conscientious objectors must themselves pay—or someone pay for them—an amount larger than a private's wage, in order not to be a soldier. Those who defend these camps argue that this is a sacrifice we must make. Who says so? The law says nothing about the kind of sacrifice the C. O.'s conscience should direct him to make. Or have we now government of conscience by sectarian decree?

It is said that these camps will be a training ground for "creative democracy." Democracy is a political concept. Are C. O.'s to be instructed in political philosophy—at $35 per month? That seems a bit expensive. Perhaps it will be the Christian kind of democracy—a higher grade, and worth more. Are we to understand, then, that the N.S.B.R.O. undertook the financial responsibility of these camps for the sake of indoctrinating a few thousand young men with a generalized religio-democratic theory of social reform? This seems to be the case.

During the last war, 504 conscientious objectors faced court-martial for their convictions. Of this number, 30 per cent were philosophical and political objectors. (Milner and Conklin, *Harper's,* October, 1939.) While these non-religious objectors were but a fraction of all those who refused to participate in war, they were nevertheless nearly a third of the *fighters* for peace. It is just to propose that non-religious objectors will be similarly effective in the present struggle against war, and that their relative number has not diminished. Probably all of them will prefer to give their year of service in camps wholly under the direction of the government. Seclusion from government is not their ideal. They do not think that we will get a better form of democracy by running away from what we have. What the religious people call a sacrifice they can only regard as escapism.

It would be consistent with this point of view to feel that the religious groups have actually done harm to American democracy by assisting the government in evading its responsibility to establish its own camps. Legislators need to face this issue, however irksome. Why should harassed government officials be comforted by assurances that they can forget about the conscientious objectors? Conscientious objectors ought not to wish the government to forget them; their stand is political as well as conscientious, for it is taken in protest against a specific act of the government.

It may be true that some far-reaching program of education is needed to bring our nation to that point of moral development where it will renounce war as an instrument of national policy. But has any private group, religious or otherwise, the right to manipulate a federal law in order to further *its* theory of reform? What if some political party had been able to do what the N.S.B.R.O. has done? Or a Buddhist group? What would the Christians be saying? Does the fact that the religious objectors constitute a numerical majority justify the remarkable union of church and state functions that has been accomplished in these camps?

Fortunately, the arrangement of the N.S.B.R.O. with the government is temporary. It may be that the government will see fit to establish other types of camps in which conscientious objectors will be paid for the work they do, and be supervised by regular government employes. These camps should not be the result of what any special group "wants," but simply the carrying out of the provisions of the law. That is all any American ought to ask of his government. If he does not like the law, then he can work for a better one. That is the American way.

Liberty in Community

DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE

Our problem is not one of freedom and liberty versus tyranny. We have two problems, one that of democracy versus tyranny, and the other that of freedom or liberty, if you will, versus organization.

We cannot live alone in utter freedom to do what we will, when we will, and as we will. If we partake of such freedom it becomes license, it becomes wanton liberty, anarchy, and chaos. All our behavior is restrained daily, constantly, in one way or another. It may be by traffic signals when we want to drive through city streets, or by a policeman who will not let us park where we want; it may be that we cannot take a job without union membership, or hire any worker we might choose; or it may mean we have to succumb to certain regulations in building a home, or drilling a well for water. If we think about it we are constantly confronted with curbs on our liberty. I live in a big house in the suburb of a large city. My daughter and I live here alone, yet I am told I cannot turn my house into three apartments because this neighborhood is "zoned" against apartments.

And yet I feel, I know, that I live in freedom, a freedom for which I am daily and increasingly grateful, a freedom the like of which I should like to see extended throughout the world.

Why do I feel free? Because I have had a hand, so to speak, in determining those curbs on my freedom, have had a vote to cast for deputies who serve *my* interest, have had a voice in the deliberations which have placed certain restraints on each individual for the good of the many, the community as a whole. These restraints which are put on communities, by communities, for the benefit *of* communities, and which are put on each individual similarly, without discrimination, constitute democracy at work, democracy functioning. We have passed the stage where we conceive freedom to be license, where we conceive democracy to mean that each man may be a law unto himself. We are not fuzzy-brained or muddle-headed about that any more. No, our trouble lies in the fact that we are still fuzzy-brained and muddle-headed about what constitutes a community.

I believe a community to be a group of people who are conscious of the fact that they have common needs and interests. It is as simple as that. And once a group of people are thus aware, they set up government, some form of deliberative body, which will implement their communal needs and wishes.

When an individual believes that his behavior, some particular thing he wishes to do, has nothing to do with anyone else, in no way intrudes on or impairs the activity of another individual, he pleads the right of freedom of action, of personal liberty, of individual sovereignty. But when he realizes that his undertaking might harm someone else or when he realizes that if everyone acted similarly, society would be handicapped, then we hope he realizes the wisdom of having curbs put on his freedom which will safeguard him when others would like to act similarly.

Or, when an individual wants something accomplished for himself and his family, something that may involve great expense, if he can convince all people in the community that they have similar needs and desires, then the enterprise can be undertaken as well as financed jointly.

Just as this relationship between an individual and his local community must be understood, so, too, must a similar relationship between smaller and larger communities be understood.

If meat is grown and slaughtered and consumed in a small area and by a few people, that area and those people constitute the community that is interested in the quality, the price, the condition of that meat and can invoke their own safeguards for it.

If the whole Middle West is serviced by the Chicago Stock Yards, that area constitutes a community which, as a whole, has an interest in providing and the right to invoke certain pure food laws, certain inspection guaranties, certain health and sanitary measures. Suppose this community creates a body of experts with which it is satisfied. Let us assume we have a commission consisting of veterinarians, of air conditioning experts, of cattle men, of transport agents, and so forth. Let us assume that they deliberate, vote, and abide by the will of the majority. They have been duly elected by a group that conceived of itself as a community, they have deliberated, and they have acted according to the will of the majority of members. Curbs on liberty? Yes. A series, long and difficult, of standards has been worked out, has been evolved with the idea of safeguarding the health of each member of the community and to which each cattle man or live-stock breeder has to conform. I call this democracy at work, and I say that the greater the area the Chicago Stock Yards serves the greater the community that has a right to representation in prescribing the safeguards.

All the situations in the battle for States' rights, and those where the federal government has felt the need of greater authority, could, I should think, be put quite simply to the test as to whether a problem is common to just one state, to many, or to all of them.

The new Federal Kidnapping Act is a case in point. When travel was slow and kidnappers could not escape easily, each state felt kidnapping was its particular problem, each state prescribed its own punishments, evolved its own techniques for catching kidnappers. But in this day of automobiles and airplanes it is obvious that the community interested in detecting and catching the kidnapper is larger than Illinois, or Ohio, or Kentucky; the nation becomes the community, with federal agents able to operate quickly in all states. The Lindbergh act becomes the law of the land.

Modern invention, modern progress in methods of transportation and communication are facts which are making our whole world shrink into the proportions of a little village. I sit at my radio and listen not alone to comment on what has gone on in Paris and London during the day, but I listen to Paris and London and hear what is going on *there* at that moment, just as some neighbor over the back fence used to tell me what she had cooking on the stove at that moment in her kitchen. Yes, our world is fast becoming a little village, and who does not know that a little village is the primary, and since the prehistoric times has always constituted the primary, notion of a community,—the primary unit for the setting up of government?

Simon Bolivar conceived that the Western Hemi-

sphere was a community, that its countries had similar interests and needs, and so, in 1826, called the first Pan-American conference. Alexander Hamilton and George Washington conceived that the thirteen original states had common needs and aspirations and set up a constitution that would make them function as a whole. Abraham Lincoln conceived that the North and the South were one community with similar needs, that the rule of the majority must obtain, that no state or group of states could withdraw from the community because of an unwillingness to abide by its majority decisions, that if such a breaking up of a community were to be permitted human society would disintegrate ultimately to a state where each community was merely a little family confined to its own dooryard.

Some communities that have been created have succeeded to the great benefit of all members. Others have failed, have fallen apart, because of smaller groups within the community demanding individual freedom, sovereign rights to act and do as they pleased, without realizing the need for exerting curbs on that liberty for the benefit of a wider community with similar needs. I think particularly of Gran Colombia in South America, where each of the three states was not willing to abide by the rule of the majority and so the union broke up into Ecuador, Venezuela, and Colombia, three sovereign nations. When I see now the five countries watered by the LaPlatte River get together to form trade agreements and customs unions I ask if it would not have been far better for Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, all poverty-stricken today, to have stayed united in one Gran Colombia?

I ask if it would not have been better under some kind of world government to have sensed that we were a world community, in which the little child named Manchuria was kidnapped by a brutal bandit? I ask if Ethiopia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, Rumania, Bulgaria, and now Greece would have been kidnapped, if we, as a world, had conceived of ourselves as a community with common needs and aspirations, with certain laws laid down for detecting and deterring the kidnapper.

And is it too late to stop the kidnappers now? We must try, or else all be fed into the jaws of their success, there to be devoured and annihilated, there to be torn limb from limb and bone from bone. Instead of throwing any more innocent lambs to the wolves until the flock is extinct let us rather unleash a pack of bloodhounds on their trail, bloodhounds in the pink of condition, trained to their job of seeking out the wolves.

Then, perhaps, when the wolves have been destroyed, the world may become fair again, and peace reign; perhaps the arts and sciences can flourish and the sunset be enjoyed for its beauty and splendor. Perhaps man can settle down to live happily *on this* planet, blissful in the realization that the human species *is* a community with common needs and desires, common hopes and aspirations, common ideas and ideals as to what is best for survival and the enjoyment of life, common capacity for love of children and of parents, common conviction that life can be worth while and beautiful, and a joy and inspiration to those privileged to partake of it. Perhaps it will be a community in which men and maidens can fall in love in freedom, and the old die in security, and into which babes can be born to become something other than cannon-fodder.

The Approach of Reconciliation

GEORGE M. GIBSON

To bring the benevolent thought of reconciliation to bear upon a world like this may seem ambitious. The fourteenth nation has succumbed to the new tyranny; and as I write, the involvement of Russia brings the total participating millions well above 75 per cent of the world's peoples. A concession must be made to the mere bigness of the task, thus consciously suggesting in the title that no utopian solution is offered but only an approach to the problem. That much at least is prompted by the constantly reiterated charge that peace advocates do nothing to oppose regnant evil. And part of the answer lies in showing the little-used resources of our traditional Christianity which offer both ideology and program for serious peace aims.

Christianity is essentially the religion of reconciliation, meaning the act or process of making friendly those who have been estranged. Perhaps our most glaring estrangement today is in the rejection of reconciliation itself as a possible faith. Classic Christianity saw deeply into the ultimate character of the problem in insisting that man's first need was to be reconciled with God, which if it were accomplished, would heal his broken relationships with his fellows. The alienation of the modern world from God is seen in the rejection, even by Christians, of God's own manner of dealing with evil as taught in the New Testament and in the conventional doctrines of the Church. The first charge upon the spirit is to believe in belief and to have faith in faith. We may discover some of the techniques of reconciliation after faith in its desirability and possibility; we are not likely to discover them before.

The *sine qua non* of such discovery would seem to be the complete renunciation of the method of violence. This renunciation must be taken in advance of the appearance of "moral equivalents for war," and the very act of faith becomes for the devotee such an equivalent. The method of violence and the method of reconciliation are so radically different in motives and aims that it is not possible to experiment with both at the same time without nullifying the experiment. They cannot both be served. "Measures short of war," "appeasement," and "armed defense," all entirely miss the pacifist's first point, in that these rely upon violence as a last resort when other means have failed. To abandon reconciliation in the presence of conflict is to repudiate it altogether. Reconciliation is for use when there is something to reconcile.

The devotee will not lose heart though he has at hand no ready world-saving formula to offer. His first lesson in realism is taken when he can admit without losing face or faith that he cannot on the instant bring world order out of world chaos. Henceforth he will

entertain no illusions about saving the world without its own consent, or about the capacity of government to adopt in toto a pacifist program in advance of a genuine spirit and discipline in the people. He visions that day, and is sure he has the clue to the larger question, but he has a task in hand: the control of his own spirit before attempting the rule of cities and nations.

The motion is from within outward, from the personal center toward the world circumference. One of Gandhi's prime doctrines assigns his followers the task of perfecting their own spirits first, after which, purified, they may go forth into their homes, their immediate neighborhoods, and into ever-wider community, national, and world situations. This humility is not to be despised. The true mark of a man's greatness is not the size of map he looks at. And indeed it may be one of the marks of contemporary degeneracy that men will ignore the problems of self in the primary societal units while using the wide world as a stage for their conceits. So the devotee of reconciliation begins with profound personal commitment and rigorous self-discipline through prayer, study, and self-denial, lest irritations, suspicions, and pride take him by surprise in countless minor situations involving relationships with other personalities. Relentless criticism of one's own motives must be joined to generous appreciation of the motives of others.

This is no invitation to asceticism in its popular, or rather unpopular, sense. We have said the motion is from within, outward. Asceticism limits the circumference, freezes the motion, and becomes in the end socially ineffective through being self-centered. True discipline is not self-centered, but on the contrary seeks to overcome the ego-drives. Its end is the socio-spiritual self which is the only fit instrument for the service of society. Yet those who demand that pacifism get "hence into a monastery" have something on their side. It is not by accidental analogy that vital movements in reconciliation resemble the historic orders. The beginning of any demanding task is the self, and men charged with high duty retire into introspection not to remain in perfected isolation, but the better to serve their age.

Our next concern is with personal relationships in the primary social group. Here we can observe in microcosm something of the tensions and conflicts of the world; and, a thing not so easy to accomplish on a planetary scale, we can build up a body of solutions. It is the primary unit which never ceases to remind us of the hope which the world seems consistently to deny. Whatever theories may be drawn from the world as to the natural inevitability of violence or the incurable beastliness of man, the primary group offers heartening evidence that these things need not be so. One may draw many evidences in support of the doctrine of original sin if the *world* is his parish; but a closer look at families, friendships, and neighborhood groups reveals the successful practice of truth and love in these simpler relations, and draws from that experience faith to carry this spirit outward to ever-wider groupings.

Passing over the variety of personal and group relationships that might present themselves for fruitful consideration, we come to the inclusive pattern of Church. John Middleton Murry properly holds that nowhere in all ideology is to be found the kind of society we long for except in the concept of the Church as compassionate community. The current re-emphasis upon Church simultaneously with the deepening of crisis, implies a confession of the failure of a world society rooted in secularism. Ideals of justice, separate from an inclusive spiritual reality, have passed one after the other into progressive disillusionment. Scheme after scheme, seeking solution wholly in terms of economic and political forces, has demonstrated its absurdities in total collapse. A secular society whose philosophy seeks no cosmic reality beyond the visible, fails to produce the modicum of justice required for stability. The process of redemption is by way of the society within society,—the creative fellowship of those drawn together through common faith in the reality of spirit. This reconciliation of men with each other through reconciliation with God is the classic process of the Kingdom which is quite the contrary of secular social idealisms.

The liberal doctrine of the unnecessary Church must yield to a new practice of the doctrine of the Church universal, eternal and necessary. Individualism has little to offer the problem of world-brokenness. The world-life moves in groups and masses today. It cannot be either checked or directed by over-refined aesthetic solitudinarians who "can worship better in a wood than in a Church," and whose worship is invalid precisely because it is pagan and not Christian. Christian worship cannot be done in spiritual absence from the fellowship of the committed, or without reaching toward the total fellowship of the world, which, in consummation, becomes the Temple of God, its inhabitants worshipers all.

It is obvious that the existing Church falls short of its given nature, but the nature is there—not a mere human ideal, nor an empty dream, but an objective reality—and in some way attested to by every criticism against the visible churches. And these criticisms are justifiable on the ground of the churches' failure to meet the nature of the Church. The task of reconcilers is twofold: first, the purification of the existing churches, their reconciliation with their own nature; and, second, the extension of Church as compassionate community to the wider circles of modern life. This extension will include not only the recruiting of those who sense the social meanings of Christianity but also those who have been estranged from the Church. It includes also the invasion of areas of life heretofore held in isolation from moral and ethical demands. And, in its most dramatic expression, it is seen also in the world-wide task in which may be found the actual working of the only promising supernational program today.

One of the first signs of genuine spiritual awakening is a renewed interest in Church. Those who would serve humanity must serve her here, at the point of her greatest need. A group of young Anglicans, clerical and lay, have recently addressed themselves to the physical restoration of the ruins of an old abbey on an island off Scotland. This objective gives them a center of fellowship and symbolizes the necessary restoration of the Church from the ruin involved in its compromise with the world, to its original pattern as the society of peace composed of those addressed to suffering love as their only manner of dealing with evil.

Dissociation of the Church from the military purposes of State is not an impossibility, and should become more and more pronouncedly a center of insistence. Such independence of the Christian community is called for even in non-pacifist circles by men who, though they feel under political necessity to support the government, desire above all things to keep their religion clear of this involvement. But though men as

churchmen reject methods of violence while as citizens they employ them, the problem would be as yet unsolved if not untouched. The tension thus created would be healthy; the state would be disturbed by the ethical challenge, even if the challenge were no more than silence upon the part of the Christian fellowship. But the type of Christian that must be produced is not thus a divided man; he is not merely against violence *in vacuo;* he is against it as such, and will seek to bring Church and State both, through pacific means, to adopt a universally pacific doctrine.

Next, the program of reconciliation turns to the areas of social life beyond the Church, seeking the discovery and development of means of dealing to extend the borders of coöperation and thus to limit the field of violent conflict. We will limit ourselves to three major fields for illustrative purposes, the labor movement, the coöperative movement, and political action.

In staking out these fields as areas of resultful activity for peaceful enterprise, dogmatic absolutism should give way to patient and humble search. All problems in such areas are charged with relativities, and the judgments of sincere men will differ as to specific issues in concrete situations. The spirit of patient and humble search is not incompatible with the irretrievable commitment, but the very *modus operandi* of reconciliation. In all these fields there is already a body of experience. The Church has offered classic guiding principles in the form of social creeds and encyclicals. Already there are well-established procedures and techniques seeking for extension, clarification, and amendment. An encouraging beginning is in the fact that throughout the domestic situation there is general insistence upon non-violent means by the decent opinion of the total population. And rights such as the right of labor to organize is axiomatic in a democratic state. The conflicts attendant upon such organization, not only between labor and employers, but also between various labor organizations, are amenable to non-violent procedures. Wise participation in such problems by groups committed to the way of reconciliation will surely result in the discovery of skills and resources that will have a bearing upon the larger issues of international life. Basically the ends sought in the international struggle and in the class struggle are the same: how to achieve justice against tyranny. The advocate of reconciliation has wide sympathy in domestic disputes from the same people who simply cannot understand his attitude toward international conflict. I have been appealed to by both employing and employed groups to mediate conflict situations, continuance of which would have been unbearably costly both economically and in terms of human values. And upon one occasion a much-feared labor organization extended an invitation for me to sit for a number of weeks with their steering council to lead discussions in the use of the non-violent method. Most of the labor movement is as willing as most of the employing groups to seek solutions by means other than violent.

The coöperative movement brings to the contemporary struggle a tested philosophy and a practice of wide extent. The fact that this great enterprise has been ploughed under in all the Fascist-ridden countries argues nothing except the sympathetic relationship between Fascism and reactionary business forces which oppose all appearance of coöperation as a threat to privilege. What good thing has not been opposed or temporarily subdued by Fascist powers? This movement is essential economic democracy. Its benefits are not only economic but educative. As a school in applied democracy its spiritual and cultural values are not wholly lost even when its doors are closed by state order or by the pressure of powerful economic interests, and its values may be counted upon to come forward in another time in social rebirth. The Danish and Scandinavian revolutions were strong though quiet affairs of the spirit, working toward coöperative ends for many years before emergence into visible social structures. The hope that their defeat is temporary rests upon faith in democracy as the truest expression of the human spirit which will outlive the temporary derangements of world society.

Political action is the obligation of the advocate of reconciliation who is at the same time a citizen of a democratic state. Whether such action can best express itself through present existing parties or through new political alignments is among the relativities which we need not attempt to deal with here. But the idea of the citizen as the obedient servant of the State is not democratic. The democratic citizen regards himself as sharing in the public decisions, and under obligation not to turn over his prerogatives to a centralized government after which he blindly follows. Efforts to prevent general social sharing in those decisions are of the essence of tyrannical rule. The obligation to be responsible, which belongs to every citizen in a democracy, rests the more heavily upon the Christian citizen at precisely the time when the forces that make for war seek to make a rally-banner of "democracy," demanding a blind unity rather than creative participation.

A discussion of the approach of reconciliation could not conclude without reference to the historic peace churches. This type of service-work undertaken with patient sacrifice wherever humans suffer, regardless of the sins of their governments, is more and more coming into universal respect. That the Society of Friends is now doing effective work, not only in occupied territories but also in Germany, to some extent modifies the total skepticism of many interventionists concerning the approachability of the seats of tyranny with methods of good will. The Quakers have not yet won the war, but their pacific struggle since the seventeenth century furnishes the example par excellence for the wider movement as yet groping for its program. It is the highest answer to the charge that pacifists do nothing in the face of tyranny, for in these programs they are feeding the starvelings of tyranny on both sides of the battle line, restoring physical damage, and quietly seeking for relationships which, when the time is ripe, may be built upon for enduring peace.

In all of these activities the reconciler shares with cosmic forces and values in the creation of a world-order of peaceful relationships between men. In all of them he absolutely relies upon the means of peace; and in none of them, even when hard pressed, does he appropriate the methods of violence. He will suffer defeats in commitment to his vocation, just as a soldier will suffer defeat rather than desert his cause for the victorious enemy camp. He will stand fast in the days sure to come when right will seem wrong and abstinence from violence, submission to tyranny; and in the times when wrong will seem right, as when war takes on the glamour of a crusade.

Lydia G. Wentworth*

RALPH WESTLAKE

Human life is a moment's pause between two eternities: a momentary gleam of light between two caverns of infinity: a brief period of being during which the gods hand us a Pandora's box from which all the blessings escape save Hope.

Hope, the only abiding blessing, the one bulwark of sanity in an insane world, sees a star and fashions an impregnable dream.

Finally Death touches the box with the sceptre of darkness and crowns Hope with the eternal diadem of sleep. This is the one supreme Impertinence toward which the whole creation moves.

As one dieth, so dieth the other, said the scriptural Preacher. "Yea, they have all one breath . . . all go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all must turn to dust again. . . . As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more."

Ah, Love, could thou and I with Fate conspire
To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire,
  Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire!

Into this Universe, and why not knowing,
Nor whence, like Water willy-nilly flowing:
  And out of it, as Wind along the Waste,
I know not whither, willy-nilly blowing.

The Revelations of Devout and Learn'd
Who rose before us, and as Prophets burn'd
  Are all but Stories, which, awoke from Sleep
They told their comrades, and to sleep return'd.

Heav'n but the Vision of fulfill'd Desire,
And Hell the Shadow from a Soul on fire,
  Cast on the Darkness into which Ourselves,
So late emerged from, shall so soon expire.

From frozen seas to torrid zones; from shifting sands to garden spots; from the glittering lights of the great city to the hut in the hills; from the first cry of the babe to the tottering step, the palsied hand and the enfeebled mind of old age, tragedy is the lot of man.

And scattered along the roads we have traveled are the fruitless efforts, the blasted hopes, the blighting disillusionments and sorrows of our mature years. "Man never is but always to be blessed."

I do not say that life should not be tragic: I only say that it is. I do not say that death, whose coming is heralded by "sad images of the stern agony, and shroud, and pall, and breathless darkness, and the narrow house," is not good: I only say that it is the supreme tragedy of the living.

Perhaps it gives all there is of value to life, and that we should with Swinburne praise mortality and . . . thank with brief thanksgiving whatever gods may be:

That no life lives forever;
That dead men rise up never;
That even the weariest river
  Winds somewhere safe to sea.

Then stars nor sun shall waken,
  Nor any change of light;
Nor sound of water shaken
  Nor any sound of sight:
Nor wintry leaves nor vernal,
Nor days nor things diurnal;
Only the sleep eternal
  In an eternal light.

Man has no soul to save for that stupidly gorgeous and hazy heaven conceived in the pathetic childhood of the race: he has but a life to live, a life in the here and now.

And in an impersonal universe, with no friend but man to guide—where only man pities and sympathizes and seeks to save—it matters tremendously to what star we hitch our wagon, for we are the actual makers of human destiny.

More than that, we are links in the endless chain of life. To us history's struggling and martyred dead have committed all that life has won from chaos in ages past. Only through us can that trust from the past be kept whole and strong and transmitted to the future.

Only through the individual can the continuity of those potent elements of human destiny—the best in individual and social life—be preserved and enlarged; and the achievement of that conduct which will conserve and enhance those values is the supreme issue of life.

Today, we, who have learned to face the facts and issues of life and death, are gathered here to pay a tribute of love, affection, and appreciation to a noble and useful woman who discovered the true way of life: to a dauntless comrade who walked the path of righteousness in the light of the morning star.

To glorify the Spirit of Brotherhood, to create and preserve those spiritual things which are of value to the enrichment of life in this indifferent universe, to arouse our spirits, to stir our aspirations, to consecrate us to new adventures, to unfold new and wonderful vistas, to live and labor in the splendor of a distant goal, these are the things for which she strove, these the radiant purpose which crowned her graying head with glory!

The ideals for which Lydia G. Wentworth lived and labored can never die. The seeds she has sown have sunk deeply in the hearts of her friends, her comrades, and her readers. There they will grow and flourish and bring forth fruit, and thus the work she has done will be as nothing to the harvest which is to come.

High and low sought her friendship; hundreds wrote to her, and scores came to her chamber as the Magi came to the lowly stable of the star, bearing their richest gifts: their heartfelt loving-kindness, their golden threads of friendship, their undying gratitude.

And so we meet her here today, not in death, but in the only immortality we know: the immortality of her good and generous deeds, her winged words and righteous thoughts, her constructive work and loving service to the whole wide world.

Rousseau has said that in the open hands of death we find only what they have given away; and if this be true, surely our friend, comrade, and sister passed away on the wings of the Everlasting Change with hands o'erflowing with treasures the dead may take with them to their sacred place of rest.

Her life of course was not a grand success, as the contemporary world measures success; neither did she find contentment.

Success and contentment are not the rewards of the radical, of the person of great imagination, of him who is crucified for the sins of man, who suffers with

*Address delivered by Ralph Westlake at the funeral of Lydia G. Wentworth, long-time friend of UNITY and contributor to its columns.

the wretched and cries out for justice, of him who sees the vision from afar and gives the mighty trust and sends this whirling orb a century nearer the kingdom of happiness on earth.

Success consists in doing nothing, in doing it gracefully, and in climaxing the effort by a prudent creeping into an orthodox grave: into a tomb which is forgotten ere the cock crows thrice.

It is only Emerson's "elect of God"—the chosen vehicles of progress—who are discontented and unsuccessful. It is only these who dare forget themselves into immortality!

These are they who chart their course by a headland which lies deeply buried in the future: a projecting cliff of light lying far beyond the vision of those who chase the evanescent rainbows of success, or who find contentment in hoarding a fortune from a world of want.

Lydia G. Wentworth lived in discontent and died a failure because the world, still darkened by dense clouds of superstition and savagery, was unable to comprehend the light of her message. "O men and brothers!" she cried. "War fails, try peace; put up the useless sword! Hate hath no harm for love," so ran her song; "and peace unweaponed conquers every wrong."

There comes a time to old folks when they begin to grow aweary of the sun; when woodland, field and stream no longer hold enchantment; when they think of autumn with its mellow dreams, of winter with its peace and ice-bound ways, of yellow sunlight slanting on the hills, of leaveless solitudes, where clouds are silenced and no bird sings.

Spent with living, and broken of body, they long for peace beyond the earth's emprise: a sanctuary for their soul's repose. But finding none, they turn their tired and dimming eyes to that still time when death, like snow, shall steep their dreary world in silence and hearts in sleep.

And this is the end of all our dreams, the final answer to every prayer. Here the music of the soul trails off into the eternal symphonies, here the final curtain falls.

Vainly we seek to penetrate the veil that hides the dead: from the lips of mystery there comes no word, from out the brooding darkness of death's sanctuary there appears no gleam of light. It is a tongueless secret locked in fate.

Sleep on, brave Comrade! No harm can touch you now. Within thy placid brow the sullied drifts of memory, of grief and pain, of vain hungerings, shall lie as white, shall lie as cool as snow.

Life with its Golgothas, its thorns and tears, has faded away on the wings of slumber. Nothing shall break or reach your rest, or stir your temples from the eternal dream.

> Flakes of the water, on the waters cease!
> Soul of the body, melt and sleep like these.
> Atoms to atoms—weariness to rest.
> Ashes to ashes—hopes and fears to peace!

Farewell! We loved you living, and we love you now.

Thoughts on Robert Nathan's Book, "A Winter Tide"*

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

> Only the goats in the wilderness will survive this
> Burning of cities, this war, this crying of children.
> Only the kids in the desert will see the morning,
> And slowly making their way back over the mountains
> Feed again in peace in the shattered cities.

Are these, by chance, words of Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa, or is this a more recent voice?

> It would be wiser, since we live in fear,
> To use our sorrows to correct our ways.

No, this is not Jeremiah speaking.

> Allow no cloud to mar this perfect day.

Has Isaiah's vision of a world at peace come true, at last, or is Nathanael still dreaming under his fig-tree?

It matters not which voice this is. Again a prophet has arisen in the line of historic succession. A Jew has been born in exile, as all true poets are—not least the greatest Poet of all who, in an act of unfathomable humility, came down from heaven. The Waters of Babylon have become broad as the Atlantic Ocean, but they are no more bitter than the river of long ago. Home is no further away than when it took weeks for a camel caravan to plod through the heat of the desert. The Israelites still wander in the wilderness while

> Low over Egypt westward sinks the sun.

The sun of the oppressor—Egypt, Rome, Nazi Germany—give the tyrant what name you will.

> The stars, the moon, cruelly and coldly shining,
> And Egypt's sun, rising and sinking forever,
> Sinking forever.

Yes, the sun of the oppressor in spite of false dawns, is always *sinking forever*. For heaven and earth are always passing away, while *My words* (the words of the Spirit) remain. Echoed from mouth to mouth down through the ages, familiar as the recurring spring, repetitious as moonlight on the sea. For it is not the legions of soldiers, the cohorts of bombing-planes—those pale replicas of the primal evil—that finally overthrow the oppressor, but *My words* which, being out of time, condemn all things in time. The sword of the Spirit is a scythe which mows through history, that the good may be gathered into barns, and the evil cast into the flame of forgetfulness. The sword of the Spirit is *immortality*.

What has all this to do with a book written by an American in twentieth century New York? At least it serves to show how little the world has changed. The immemorial pattern repeats itself once more. Again

> There is a grief of voices in the sky,
> An evil in the dark.

Of old a city knew not the things which belonged unto its peace, nor heeded the saying spoken a few decades before the sack of Jerusalem, "Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you." It bears repeating now.

> Christian, awake and watch upon the height;
> The day is dying in the darkening air.
> There is but little time before the night;
> There is but time for prayer.

But again

> . . . God walks, as in an older time,
> In beauty on the hills.

And

> . . . still the heart, by love and pity wrung,
> Finds the same God as when the world was young.

Ah, but the world is always young to those who find this God!

*Published by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York City. 54 pp. $2.00.

The Study Table

A Statesman of Eternity

THE WAY OF ALL SPIRIT. *By E. Merrill Root. Chicago: Packard and Company.* 152 *pp.* $1.75.

Columbus discovers a new America. Washington claims for us this "America of the spirit." Lincoln proclaims its unity—and ours. Down the American highway Don Quixote rides against giants which the nearsighted, looking up from adding-machine editorials and down from their cash-register pulpits, mistake for windmills. They live—no, not again but still, and with life more abundant—in *The Way of All Spirit.*

More, Van Gogh paints with words, Beethoven translates his chords into phrases in this luminous map for the next century, this blueprint for universal brotherhood. For great souls recapitulate the noblest exceptions that have been and reveal what commoners yet shall be. *The Way of All Spirit* is a great book because it is by a great soul: E. Merrill Root.

But this brilliant and beautiful book refuting the way of all flesh was not penned with dead men's bones or thoughts. There is no more of death in it than there is in life. The author gives you all any author can give: himself . . . but there is more of him than meets the eye or even the mind. We know no one else who could have written this book. One of the "statesmen of Eternity," of whom he writes, he has the wisdom that is beauty of thought. One of the greatest poets of the English language, he also is master of the beauty that is wisdom in form. Only a great poet could write such prose.

Whether he writes of this "sleepy star," the earth, or of the inner kingdom of gay pessimists who know that "we succeed only by our highest possible failure," or of the world's Huckleberry Finns who realize that *"Doing* is the true opium of the people," of the blossomed apple-tree, "that fountain of dimpled butterflies," or of the soul, he never sinks to "the passport of a platitude" but always proves his divinity by creating.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

BOOK NOTES BY CHARLES A. HAWLEY

The Influence of Schleiermacher

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCHLEIERMACHER. *By Richard B. Brandt. New York: Harper and Brothers.* 350 *pp.* $3.00.

The influence of Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher has been potent in both theology and philosophy. Few, however, have had a true concept of his philosophy since no school was named for him, and no disciples debated his ideas. He has been widely overshadowed in this respect by his contemporary, Hegel. There are Hegelians and Neo-Hegelians, but no such school named for Schleiermacher. Professor Brandt's book, therefore, is a valuable and timely contribution to the history of philosophy. He gives a thorough analysis of Schleiermacher's philosophy, its relation to his theology, and its relation to the philosophy of Hegel and his lesser contemporaries. All this goes to show that Schleiermacher's system of philosophy has received less study than his theology. To Americans this book is important for another reason: Schleiermacher's influence on American thought. The author gives his attention to Schleiermacher's influence on present-day thinkers, but the nineteenth century New England group was greatly influenced by Schleiermacher. This is so important for a correct understanding of our cultural development that it deserves at least a separate monograph.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Psychiatry and Theology

SPRINGS OF CREATIVE LIVING. *By Rollo May. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.* $2.00.

The clergy of the present day are pretty well aware that "healing cometh from above." The author of this book, Rollo May, after completing the regular theological course at Union Seminary, continued his study under the great Adler. In his work with the Y. M. C. A., he became known as a skilful counsellor. At present he is pastor of the First Congregational Church of Verona, New Jersey, where he continues his work as an eminent authority in pastoral psychiatry. The world of disordered emotions in which we now live demands this kind of work. Every minister should have some equipment in this field; but a caution should go with this statement; here a little knowledge may be a dangerous thing. Mr. May is an authority and his book should be read and pondered well.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Again to the Lord's Prayer

THE CREED OF CHRIST. *By Gerald Heard. New York: Harper and Brothers.* $2.00.

It is an interesting and a hopeful sign to see how this disordered epoch is sending thinking men and women to a fresh examination of the Gospels and to the Jesus they find there. This book, an important interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, is the result of a series of lectures delivered in Allan Hunter's church in Hollywood. The book sparkles with unforgettable phrases. Jesus "died, not merely to give us an example, nor to accept willingly his responsibility for us all and for the mistake of all temporal life; he died also for himself, that he might be reborn in the full power of a timeless life." With that interpretation, the Church may become the embodiment of the spirit, the mind, of Christ. Living in this "timeless life," a new world can be born, a world embodying the theme of the Lord's Prayer, the ever-coming kingdom of God.

When through the Depths

When through the depths we sink to sorrow's deep,
We do not weep.

When to the outpost of life's hurt we come,
Our lips are dumb.

Frightened, confused, we struggle for relief,
Deadlocked with grief.

The heart that song for high occasion makes,
In silence breaks:

As the seed splits, in winter, underground:
No cry. No sound.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Correspondence

Vital and Affirmative

To UNITY:

Thank you for the July issue of UNITY which came today. The cover page is wonderful. At last UNITY is vital, affirmative, and unafraid.

This is only a small personal note to let you know how one subscriber feels.

LUCY ADAMS WILLIAMS.

Westfield, New York.

Comprehensive and Concise

To UNITY:

I have just now finished reading the editorial by Curtis W. Reese in the July UNITY. It seems to me to justify the adjective, "great."

It is both comprehensive and concise, both liberal in spirit and conservative in its recognition of present values, realistic in recognition of current conditions, and optimistic in its planetary emphasis. I have seen nothing in UNITY in months which seemed to me to have so much of permanent value in it. If at any point I differ, it is that I am more hopeful of socialism, not capitalized, than certain of his expressions indicate. Also, I am glad you have introduced a few personal items, and wish you would extend it to include a who's who of your writers.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Los Gatos, California.

Entirely Reasonable

To UNITY:

Our copy of UNITY came this morning and I want to send you most hearty thanks for the editorial by Curtis W. Reese. It is so sane and encouraging and so entirely reasonable. And yet, if you had not had the bit on the front cover *also* it would not have been so satisfactory. The two editorials—the short one and the long one—are just what people need to think of, and I shall certainly lend my UNITY all around until as many as possible have read it.

ROSE W. SNELL.

Sierra Madre, California.

Democracy through Socialism

To UNITY:

In the July issue of UNITY, in the editorial by Curtis W. Reese, he says, "There is a good reason to believe that socialism does not do full justice to all the requirements of human nature." Well, he admits that capitalism, with its cruel injustice, its desolating wars and imperialism, does not answer the requirements of human nature. Socialism will have trials of error and partial successes, just as did our partial democracy that our fathers established. It was an improvement on the Divinity of Kings, but a larger justice demands the fellowship of coöperation, democracy through socialism. I may be mistaken.

E. H. BARRETT.

Lansing, Michigan.

Felicitations

To UNITY:

The signed statement by Curtis W. Reese on the front cover of the July issue of UNITY is fine, and I hasten to offer felicitations.

Frankly, this country of ours is in a mess. This man Hitler has gone far further than anyone would have dreamed possible. Most of it is due to the Lindbergh, Wheeler, Taft, Vandenberg, and pacifist attitude in each of the countries he crushed. Despite the example of country after country, where the same futile faith in humanity, belief in treaties, and solemnity of pledged word, caused many people to oppose anything that would irritate the aggressor, here in the United States many good people, and a lot of timid people, and a lot of foolish people, and some designing and really unpatriotic people, pool their varying and largely contradictory reasons, and unite in opposing the doing of anything at all. It is a wonder that President Roosevelt and those with him dare do anything.

We have been very fortunate to have in the White House these past years a man who, with all his faults and mistakes, has forced to be written into our statutes what will now never come out: sound humanitarian legislation for the underdog, for labor, for the farmer, for someone other than the big business interests which have fattened from tariffs and other special legislation all my adult life. And do they hate "that man in the White House"? They do. Some things have been done. The outlook is for a little better world after this present fight is over, provided those who are in favor of recognizing human rights (more or less) win. But if Hitler wins, it may be fifty years before enough opposition can be got together to break down the German hold on the world. And then humanity will almost have to start from scratch, and retrace the long road up to intelligent fairly-democratic nationalism, and following that the long road to intelligent internationalism and a "federation of the world."

Some old Hebrew wrote long ago that he had never seen the righteous forsaken, or his seed begging bread; and while his observation had not been sufficiently extensive, yet there is an *element* of truth in his statement. I have no faith in a God who hears prayers, or interferes here; but surely, in the great economy of the cosmos, it just CANNOT be that Germany can win.

HENRY H. GRIFFITHS.

Des Moines, Iowa.

Editorial Anonymity

To UNITY:

It is a question whether or not the abandonment of the editorial *we* represents "a reasonable extension of liberal policies in the field of journalism"; your decision to discontinue the use of editorial anonymity is debatable, at least.

Balancing the advantages against the objections there seems to be a preponderance of reasons in favor of editorial anonymity. The greatest of these is that the effectiveness of any editorial is inevitably influenced by the reader's response to the personality of the writer and by the bias set up in the reader's mind through previous reactions concerning the writer. In some instances these influences may be advantageous but, since the object of an editorial is to express an idea, a point of view or an opinion, it is necessary to avoid stirring the emotions in order to let the words speak truly their own message.

It is to be hoped that your decision is not irrevocable and that you will again find a place in UNITY for editorial anonymity, both for Curtis W. Reese and for John Haynes Holmes.

PAUL P. SWETT.

Bloomfield, Connecticut.

Not Interested in "Journal of Opinion"

To UNITY:

If UNITY loses its pacifist position it will lose its distinctiveness, and, as far as I am concerned, its value. I am not interested in just another "journal of opinion."

ORLIE PELL.

New York, N. Y.

Policy

To UNITY:

Only the fact that my typewriter has gone back on me and that I have much more correspondence than I can get done by hand has kept me from writing before this my protest over UNITY's recent change of policy. It is distressing—like losing an old and valued friend because of his complete change of attitude and spirit, until he becomes an essentially different person, with whom one loses fellowship because there is little common ground left. It is a shock to have this happen with UNITY because for so many years, first under Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and now for twenty years under Dr. Holmes, it has been a paper distinctive in character and therefore in service. One understands differences of judgment and opinion in a time like this. But even so, with UNITY it seems like a going back on one's own life history and purpose. There are many of us who feel that it is the forsaking of a great tradition and a great call. It is a little as though the Society of Friends should change its historic attitude because of changes in conviction on the part of a few leaders. One can hardly imagine that happening. Said leaders would probably seek a different affiliation and not expect all those connected with the Society to join them in a new attitude, involving a complete break with the past.

ROBERT B. WHITAKER.

Lintsing, China.

Fundamental Differences

To UNITY:

I have read, with great care, Curtis W. Reese's editorial, "The Beginnings of a New World," and take issue with many of the statements and conclusions. They certainly show no depth of thought. He seems to approve of a "philosophy of humanity based on realizable goods." Since when have "realizable goods" been worthy of the regard which this editorial claims for them? Why not quote the Bible occasionally—either the Old or the New Testament, if one has a choice? I challenge the writer to find one word therein in favor of "realizable goods."

"As evidence of what might be, we have but to cite a third asset, namely, the achievements of technology in the mastery of the forces of nature in the last generation or so. In the developments of the arts and the instrumentalities of civilization, technology has within a relatively brief period demonstrated that what appeared to be the wildest hopes could become current reality." What has technology accomplished except to make the rich richer and the poor poorer? To what uses technology could or should be put is not to be considered for the moment.

"We now know that human drudgery and poverty are evils that need not be continued and there is good reason to believe that man will not continue to tolerate them." With the first clause of this sentence I am heartily in accord, but search history as we may, what reason is there to even hope that the generations to come will be wiser than the preceding ones? True, there have been rebels, thank God! in every civilization, indeed in each generation, but theirs is but a voice crying in the wilderness.

"In our time, administration as such has flowered into public administration and we now know how to coördinate materials, persons, and processes and to marshal them for desired public purposes." Do we? Let us examine the statement. "Public administration"—if the proper meaning is given to "public,"—of or belonging to the people—I deny this. Who can dare say that "public administration" is of the people? Coördinate, indeed! The individual, in whom only there is hope, merged into the machine! Why not go further and say coördinate (or have possession of) "persons, their faculties and possessions"? Is this going too far?

"We have at our disposal today assets which if utilized can make of the world of the future a thing of beauty and nobility beyond the dreams of the prophets and the seers who had no such instrumentalities with which to build the world of their dreams." With this, I am happy to agree. The assets have always been there, and since the days when man became a reasoning being, they have been more or less recognized. I note no hesitancy in using the words, "prophets and seers." Why not go a step further and use the words God and Jesus? Is the present generation afraid of these words? Has it substituted the worship of humanity for the worship of God? We have the means—but not the ones which this entire article indicates.

"Among these trends are the passing of the old individualism, the emergence of corporate enterprise, the recognition by government of its primary responsibility for the well-being of persons and society, and the steady growth of planetary consciousness." Not a phrase in this sentence can be considered seriously. The government has never recognized its responsibility for the well-being of persons and society, and rightly so. That is not and never has been the function of government. It is not a beneficial society. A paternal society, yes. It would force persons and society into one mould—its mould, and are persons and society to be grateful for being forced into the mould? The answer is evidently yes, but what a despicable role to play. God, in his bounty, gave us reasoning faculties. If we would but use them, stand in the image of God and thunder forth, "I do rebel, as my forefathers rebelled." Ah, what a world to live in—the first Utopia of the ages!

"Individualism"—or to be absolutely accurate—"old rank individualism" is dealt with slightly. Why not "rank individualism"? Rank honesty, rank loyalty, rank truthfulness, rank rebel even, carry no such connotation. How can one be an individualist without being a rank one! Must one be half-baked? "No man ever lived unto himself alone." For the first time I am in hearty accord—but let us follow this thought further; neither can man live for his fellow creature alone, and this, it seems to me, many of the serious-minded of this generation are trying to do. Does it give them a superior feeling, I wonder? Is it not time for us to inquire why we—mere, inconsequential atoms—were put into this world? Let us assume, for the moment, that it is to make the world a better place for our fellow creatures. How can we do this unless our first and most important thought is to make ourselves fit for such a part? Surely our first duty is to ourselves; to make our own lives as rich and full and beautiful as possible. Then, and then only, perhaps, we may be able to enrich the lives of others.

"We must not allow the current identification of corporate actions with totalitarian regimes to blind us to the demonstrable achievement of corporate action in democratic society." Where, oh where, can one find a democratic society? Far beyond the days of Socrates or even Demosthenes, the wise man has been searching for it.

"Men united can do what men singly could never do." Right again! They can, but when have they? History holds out no hope that they ever will, except over infinitesimal periods.

"As a collective instrument of social action government is corporate action par excellence." A sad commentary, "par excellence." Let us examine this subject. What has the government done for us? Given us police service, to be sure, but we could have that at an infinitesimal part of the cost. On the other hand it has "par excellence" taxed the independence out of the people; it has taxed the people for other people's war; it has spilled the blood, crippled the bodies, and ruined the minds of the youth of our country—the youth, in whom only, the hope of the world lies; it has made liars and blackmailers of the people—and this is government "par excellence."

". . . . Never again can any government be called a satisfactory government so long as its citizens are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed." This condition has always prevailed and will always prevail, not because the government has not looked after the people's welfare, but because it has! Why not teach the people instead of giving them dole, thus making paupers of them? But, this "government par excellence" one may say, is an Utopian government. Wishful thinking! One can impute desirable attributes to everything, to every person.

"The government exists for the citizens, not the citizens for the government." Would that this were true! Government has never existed "for the people, of the people, by the people!" It never can; it is not the function of government.

". . . . The present-day world is growing a planetary sense which is producing in increasing abundance a citizenry able to rise above ethnic and national provincialism to citizenship in a world community." I defy the writer to prove this—nay, to even prove the desire.

"We have at least begun to think and feel and plan in world terms." Nowhere, the length and breadth of this sphere is there such thinking, feeling, or planning. Isolated groups there are, thank God! but movements, there are none.

". . . . We should now tackle with courage and persistence the problems that await solutions at the hands of the new citizens of a new world." The problem granted, but "new citizens of a new world"—where could one look for them? It would be as difficult as Diogenes' search for an honest man—far more difficult than looking for a needle in a haystack.

". . . . Free men"—men have never been free since they set up a government to relieve them of the responsibilities which they formerly shouldered for themselves. Men do not want to be free. Government is their fetish.

". . . . The problem of motivation which we must solve in a way that will release the deeper emotions." Aye, there's the rub! Emotions! Does one not dare say principles, or is emotion the word really meant? Emotion is the curse of the world today. Let us put away emotion as we flatter ourselves we have put away sentimentality, and let us get down to realities.

"Beyond truth and greater than justice is the motivation of love, of affection, of good will." No, and again no! Nothing is greater than truth and justice. These we owe to our Creator; love, affection, good will we try to give to our fellow creatures. Of what availeth it to gain the whole world and lose one's own soul? Of what avail to help one's fellow man, if truth and justice be put in second place. If one is not true and just, how can he be of use to any man? This is absolutely opposed to the teachings of Jesus and any non-believer, any atheist, any agnostic believes—nay, acclaims—these teachings.

"Intelligence, knowledge, love—these three, but the greatest of these is love." Love of the Creator, in whose image man is made; of Nature spread so lavishly before our wondering eyes; of opportunity, so easy to grasp if our government had not made it so difficult; or is it love of our fellow man, as insignificant, ignorant, and cowardly as we?

". . . . The means to live effectively." The material for

such a philosophy of life is available. Pleasant sounding words, which roll easily from the tongue, and high ideals. But what is faith without works? "There is good reason to believe . . . ." Here, for once, the writer enters the sphere of uncertainty, at the time when certainty is in order. Certainly "socialism" does not do full justice to all the requirements of human nature. How rarely one meets a so-called socialist who knows what socialism is or, knowing, dares admit that it is confiscation, pure and simple. The last two paragraphs of this editorial stripped of all its verbiage, give rise to speculation —even to prophesy, which is a precarious undertaking.

". . . . Distribute the abundance that earth makes easy and that science and technology make possible. . . . " Ah, yes, an Utopia, indeed! But when distributed, the abundance must be redistributed in each subsequent generation. Thus the industrious become impoverished, the lazy shiftless, the worthless fare better than the workers. Why not look this question squarely in the face, give mankind equal opportunities and thereafter let them stand or fall by their own exertion? It can be done, but probably never will be. Years of coddling have stupefied the brains—mankind no longer wishes to think; to give affection, love and, strangely enough, even money, is far, far easier. Let us hitch our wagons to a star, and aspire to reach its height, but let us look realities in the face, and not expect the star to drag us up.

HELEN SWIFT NEILSON.

Green Lake, Wisconsin

Totalitarianism Versus Democracy

TO UNITY:

As a friend, admirer, and disciple of the Leader of the Community Church whose prophetic utterances always echo the woes of humanity and the hopes of the seers and the prophets of all ages, I have always found in my mind the name of John Haynes Holmes in line with those of that first great liberator of Egyptian bondage, Moses, of Isaiah, of Socrates, of the Nazarene, of Emerson, Gandhi, Tolstoi, and Kagawa. In my mental vision I found them always together, as if seated in the front row of the great judges over human follies and iniquities at that solemn trial of the Judgment Day as depicted in the hieroglyphic scriptures of *The Book of the Dead.* With this introduction, it is clear how difficult and painful it must be to take issue with one's superior. Yet here it is: it must be done; for the realities of our living are more potent than the dearest dreams of our wishful thinking. And the real lives of humanity are whipped by the real actualities of the world in which they live. We may dream our beautiful dreams; but even they are conditioned by the cruel status quo. As a single illustration, we may remind ourselves of the mental anguish of the peace-loving Einstein who bows to reality and takes his stand.

Dr. Holmes has written a series of seven editorials in UNITY (July, 1941) which, to one reader at least (and I can speak only for myself with my limitations), seem to lack the very perspective which makes for clear thinking and practical guidance. And in these times that try again our very souls, clear thinking and practical guidance must be at the very base of intelligent human effort.

Does Dr. Holmes honestly believe, with a mind of a realist and with a heart full of love and concern for struggling humanity, I repeat, does he really manage to convince himself that a Hitler peace and Hitler's Europe sending out its brutal agents over all the corners of the world to do his bidding will serve "the cause of peace"; or will this bring back the terrible agonies of another thousand years of a revised Dark Period? Under the totalitarian cynicism and brutality that know no limits; under an Old World oppressed by a victorious, crude, bigoted, persecuting provincialism and mad cynicism of a mythical race-complex, sowing destruction and death to all those noble aspirations that make life with its struggles worth the battle; under a peace dictated by and pledged with governments that have no honor for word or humanity, for justice or equality, for freedom or respect for personality—under such a peace, how long would peace last and how long would men like Dr. Holmes be permitted to be what they are created to be? Dr. Holmes feels that it is a "European war." But can there be an isolated war or a peace of wishful thinking when the brutal truth makes this impossible by the very conditions of modern civilized life? Is not the Western Hemisphere swarming with agents of foreign ideologies trying to assist the totalitarians from across and thus make their future victories over ourselves more certain when they win the Old World? One does not have to be an alarmist or a jingoist or what not to see where the realities of this world-struggle between Totalitarianism and Democracy may wind up. And when there is a question of life and death of the very principles that underlie our national life, we cannot and must not bury our heads in the sands of wishful thinking and let our children carry the cross of a world under the yoke of immoral, inhuman, unchristian totalitarian barbarism.

Can you appease and make peace with a regime that betrayed and swallowed Austria, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Rumania? And now Russia is in the process of a life-and-death grip, with solemnly-pledged, duly-signed "peace agreements" entered into! How long would that "negotiated peace" last and how long would Dr. Holmes' pacifism survive under that "negotiated peace"? It would most likely last till the enemies of democracy could complete their encirclement and set up enough concentration camps, then the incidents would be on hand aplenty to make new war without going into the trouble of declaring it. The blitzkrieg divisions could be relied upon to do their worst.

Is it not clear that a negotiated peace with the rulers that sway the present destinies of the Old World is nothing but an illusion serving the interests of those very disrupters of world peace who believe only in one kind of negotiation—that is, on their own terms? Does not the experience of the Scandinavian and Balkan countries and Russia prove that a negotiated peace as things stand now can mean only more intolerance, more insecurity, more sufferings and persecution, more starvation, and a world set upon military preparations with no limitations to space and time? Where will the boundaries end, as long as the appetite of the aggressors are fed by their victories. And what real chance will there be for democracy and humanity, justice and freedom, and real old-fashioned Americanism that is right in the very hearts of our men and women? What will secure our lives and liberty, once the continents of the Old World become arsenals of totalitarian hegemony, with faithful devotees doing their worst to undermine our own foundations? Can we remain at peace in a world aflame?

Dr. Holmes' language is cryptic and cynical. But these are times that call for more than cynicism and wishful thinking. This world crisis is more "than getting drunk or burning up the automobile highways." It is, as the sufferings of untold millions reveal, a very test of endurance and sacrifice. In the conflagration of the hour, with whom shall democracy negotiate? With the enemy of democracy? With whom shall justice negotiate? With the bitter foe of all justice? And if this be true, what shall we tell our sons, whose very life is in the making now? And tell them we must; be sure that we tell them the truth, and the right thing—the thing that will make possible for them the enjoyment of all the blessings the Founding Fathers had hoped to achieve with their sacrifices, daring, and very lives.

DAVID JOBMAN.

New York, N. Y.

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 86)

To the Humanist the welfare of man is the end and aim of life, to which all other ends are secondary. This involves the dignity or "sacredness" of each human individual and "faith" in the ability of man to work out his own salvation independently of a belief in the supernatural. It may well be that to have faith in man, especially in this dark period of history, will require almost as much use of the "will to believe" as does the orthodox Christian, but it is essential in order to be a Humanist. Humanism is not merely negative because it disbelieves in all the orthodox trappings of religion, but it is primarily positive and constructive in its outlook. Humanists hesitate to formulate a Creed because they do not wish to crystallize their own thoughts or impose them on others, but they have definite beliefs nonetheless. Some of these were formulated in the "Humanist Manifesto" of 1933, but they have been modified since and new tentative formulations will doubtless be made from time to time. (3) Humanism is a religion because "it is a way of life which follows necessarily from a man holding certain things in reverence." Humanism holds in reverence those men and women through history who have contributed to the enlightenment and progress of mankind and those things and tools which aid to that end. As Ingersoll said: "Real religion consists in duties of man to man."

THE ARBITRATOR.